EXHIBIT F

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 1 2 Lead: 12-23616-rdd In re: AP: 21-07023 MOSDOS CHOFETZ CHAIM INC., White Plains, New York 3 Post-Confirmation Debtor. April 5, 2022 10:17 a.m. - 2:35 p.m. 4 5 AP: 21-07023-RDD CONGREGANTS OF MOSDOS CHOFETZ CHAIM, INC. VS. MOSDOS CHOFETZ CHAIM INC. ET AL 6 • CONTINUANCE OF HEARING FROM APRIL 4, 2022 7 • SECOND MOTION FOR SANCTIONS (WITH HEARING DATE INSERTED) FILED BY 8 MICHAEL LEVINE ON BEHALF OF CHOFETZ CHAIM INC. WITH HEARING TO BE HELD ON 12/2/21 AT 09:30 AM AT VIDEOCONFERENCE (ZOOMGOV) (RDD); 9 RESPONSES DUE BY 11/26/21, (ATTACHMENTS: #1 PLEADING HENOCH ZAKS DECLARATION, #2 EXHIBIT 1, ENFORCEMENT ORDER NO. 1, #3 EXHIBIT 2, 10 NOTICE OF ENFORCEMENT ORDER, #4 EXHIBIT 3, AFFIDAVITS OF SERVICE OF NOTICE AND ENFORCEMENT ORDER, #5 EXHIBIT 4, ORIENTATION PHOTO, #6 EXHIBIT 5, TEXT MESSAGE, #7 EXHIBIT 6, ARON ZAKS PHOTOS, #8 EXHIBIT 11 7, MAYER ZAKS PHOTOS, #9 EXHIBIT 8, SHIMON/ARON ZAKS PHOTOS, #10 EXHIBIT 9, HENOCH ZAKS PHOTOS, #11 EXHIBIT 10, US MARSHAL WEBSITE 12 PRINTOUT) (ECF #136) 13 RELATED DOCUMENTS: 14 • SECOND MOTION FOR SANCTIONS TO ENFORCE PRIOR INJUNCTION FILED BY MICHAEL LEVINE ON BEHALF OF CHOFETZ CHAIM INC., (ATTACHMENTS: #1 15 PLEADING HENOCH ZAKS DECLARATION, #2 EXHIBIT 1, ENFORCEMENT ORDER NO. 1, #3 EXHIBIT 2, NOTICE OF ENFORCEMENT ORDER, #4 EXHIBIT 3, AFFIDAVITS OF SERVICE OF NOTICE AND ENFORCEMENT ORDER, #5 EXHIBIT 4, 16 ORIENTATION PHOTO, #6 EXHIBIT 5, TEXT MESSAGE, #7 EXHIBIT 6, ARON ZAKS PHOTOS, #8 EXHIBIT 7, MAYER ZAKS PHOTOS, #9 EXHIBIT 8, 17 SHIMON/ARON ZAKS PHOTOS, #10 EXHIBIT 9, HENOCH ZAKS PHOTOS, #11 EXHIBIT 10, US MARSHAL WEBSITE PRINTOUT) (ECF #134) 18 • CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF SECOND MOTION FOR SANCTIONS (WITH HEARING 19 DATE AFFIXED) (RELATED DOC 136) FILED BY MICHAEL LEVINE ON BEHALF OF CHOFETZ CHAIM INC. (ECF #137) 20 • LETTER ADVISING COURT OF DISTRICT COURT'S AFFIRMANCE OF INJUNCTION ORDERS FILED BY MICHAEL LEVINE ON BEHALF OF CHOFETZ CHAIM INC. 21 (ATTACHMENT: EXHIBIT, DISTRICT COURT ORDER AFFIRMING INJUNCTION ORDERS) (ECF #160) 22 TRANSCRIPT REGARDING HEARING HELD ON 03/04/22 AT 10:00 A.M. RE 23 NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT OF HEARING ON SECOND ENFORCEMENT MOTION AND REOUEST FOR RETROACTIVE USE AND OCCUPANCY (RELATED DOC 136) FILED BY 24 MICHAEL LEVINE ON BEHALF OF CHOFETZ CHAIM INC. WITH HEARING TO BE HELD ON 3/4/22 AT 10:00 AM AT VIDEOCONFERENCE (ZOOMGOV) (RDD) ETC. 25

Mosdos Chofetz Chaim, Inc. - 4/5/22

they are currently doing, could stay at their parent's house as far as Shimon Zaks is concerned. Namely, the house at 14 Cloverdale Lane, as opposed to at the parent's property on the CRDI property, Units 1 and 3.

Mr. Brody and the Hochman's, it is clear, each had separate residential properties off of the CRDI property that they owned and that they transferred, shortly after it became apparent that they faced potential material financial liability in this matter. One of the facts that § 273 of the New York Debtor Credit Law instructs courts to consider when deciding whether there's been an intentional fraudulent transfer as to present and future creditors.

Mr. Brody also testified that his brother has a residence in the area where he has moved substantial property from his property at the CRDI property where he and his wife apparently keep their cars, and where he seems to have cleaned out substantial amounts of stuff, which photographs show appear in many large trash bags outside the garage, at least consistent with more than just taking out the ordinary trash, but rather preparing a property for being moved into.

Rabbi Mayer Zaks has a very large house at 14

Cloverdale Lane that he occupies primarily, except for on weekends. He testified that at times he is put up whole families in the large house, which has somewhere between 10 and 12 bedrooms and multiple bathrooms. It certainly is within the

Mosdos Chofetz Chaim, Inc. - 4/5/22

realm of possibility that not only Shimon Zaks, his wife and son, but also, if in fact, I'm wrong about Mr. Brody's ability to move into his brother's house, Mr. Brody and his family, albeit that it's a large one, could move into and occupy at least until they could find a new residence. I will note that Mr. Brody testified to where he is living now is either a four-or five-bedroom house, depending on whether you count the 5th bedroom as a townhouse bedroom or a study, and that's with his ten children.

I do not believe that the evidence shows that it is impossible to find an acceptable residence off of the CRDI property. One basis for the contention is that while the respondents don't worship anymore at the CCI synagogue property, they do worship nearby, and the Cloverdale property and the other properties are roughly an hour's walk away from where they are worshiping now. But there really was no testimony that they couldn't worship somewhere else. And in fact, there was testimony that they worshiped at various places. Nor do I accept that the relative shortage of apartments in the area creates a situation where it's impossible to find a place to live. Especially for people who have recently sold, in the face of the prior injunction leading up to the September order, residential properties for large profits in hundreds of thousands of dollars.

So, I find and conclude hat the movants have